UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2572nd MEETING: 11 MARCH 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2572)	1
Tribute to the memory of Mr. Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 25 February 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16983)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2572nd MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 11 March 1985, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Blaise RABETAFIKA (Madagascar).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2572)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:
   Letter dated 25 February 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16983)

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): It was with deep sorrow that we learned of the passing of an outstanding statesman of our day, Mr. Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. As the principal United Nations organ on which Member States have conferred primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council must pay a tribute to President Chernenko for his great devotion to the cause of peace and security for all peoples, the cessation of the arms race and the elimination of the threat of a nuclear war.

2. I should like, as President of the Council and on behalf of its members, to express to the representative of the Soviet Union and, through him, to the Government of the Soviet Union, the Soviet people and the family of the deceased, our sincere condolences.

3. I now invite the members of the Council to stand and observe a minute of silence.

The representatives, standing, observed a minute of silence.

4. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): On behalf of the Soviet delegation, I should like to express our sincere gratitude to you, Mr. President, for the statement you just made on behalf of the members of the Council and to thank you for your condolences in connection with the death of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. The Soviet State and people have suffered a great loss. An outstanding Party and State official has passed away, an unswerving fighter for the cause of strengthening peace and international co-operation.

5. The activities of Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko in his high posts in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet State earned him great respect throughout the world. He devoted his entire life to faithfully serving the Soviet people and will for ever remain in the memory of the Soviet people and of the whole of progressive mankind.

6. The message of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Sovet Union, of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and of the Council of Ministers of the USSR on the occasion of the death of Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko on 11 March, stresses the consistent nature of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union; it reads as follows:

> "The Soviet State has done and is doing all that is possible and required to strengthen the socialist community, consolidate the positions of socialism throughout the world, avert nuclear catastrophe and ensure lasting peace.
>
> "We wish to see cessation of the arms race and are persistently striving to and to avert the militarization of outer space. Our ultimate objective is the total destruction of nuclear weapons throughout the planet and the complete elimination of the threat of nuclear war. The Soviet Union has unswervingly favoured and continues to favour constructive dialogue, practical measures leading to the reduction of international tensions and the establishment of an atmosphere of trust, co-operation and mutual understanding among all peoples and States."

7. The Soviet delegation will convey the condolences that have been expressed here to the Government of the Soviet Union, the Soviet people and the bereaved family.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 25 February 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16983)

8. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken by the Council at previous meetings [*2568th and 2570th meetings*], I invite the representative of Lebanon to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Jordan, Qatar, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fakhouri (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. Wasiuddin (Bangladesh), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Netanyahu (Israel), Mr. Kasrawi (Jordan), Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Al-Shaali (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam) and Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

9. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Senegal and the Sudan in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Phedonos-Vadet (Cyprus), Mr. César (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Alatas (Indonesia), Mr. Icaza Gallard (Nicaragua), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Nowak (Poland), Mr. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Sarré (Senegal) and Mr. Adam (Sudan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

10. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 7 March [*S/17011*] from the representative of Democratic Yemen. The text of the letter is as follows:

> "I have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation to Mr. Zehdi Terzi, observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization, to participate in the discussion on the item 'The Situation in the Middle East', in accordance with the Council's usual practice."

11. The proposal by the representative of Democratic Yemen is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, but if approved by the Council, the invitation to participate in the discussion would confer on the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) the same rights of participation as those conferred on Member States pursuant to rule 37. Does any member of the Council wish to speak on this proposal?

12. Mr. CLARK (United States of America): The United States opposes extending to the PLO the same rights of participation in the proceedings of the Council as if that organization represented a Member State. We have consistently taken the position that, under the provisions of the rules of procedure the only legal basis on which the Council may grant a hearing to persons speaking on behalf of non-governmental entities is rule 39.

13. For many decades, the United States has supported a generous interpretation of rule 39, and we would not object in this case. We are, however, opposed to special *ad hoc* departures from orderly procedure. In particular, the United States does not agree with the recent practice of the Council, which appears selectively to try to enhance the prestige of those who wish to speak in the Council through a departure from the rules of procedure. We consider this special practice to be without legal foundation and to constitute an abuse of the rules. The integrity of the Council's procedures, we believe, is very important.

14. For these reasons, the United States requests that you, Mr. President, put the terms of the proposed invitation to the vote. The United States will vote against.

15. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): If no other member of the Council wishes to speak at this stage, I shall take it that the Council is prepared to vote on the proposal by Democratic Yemen.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Burkina Faso, China, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Denmark, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

16. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): Australia has just abstained in the voting on the question before the Council. We did so because, in our view, the observer of the PLO should properly be invited to participate on the same basis as representatives of other organizations or bodies which are not States. To have supported a measure which would confer upon the PLO the same rights as Member States would imply that Australia recognizes the PLO. Australia does not recognize the PLO and will not do so while it maintains its denial of Israel's right to exist.

17. Australia acknowledges that the PLO, which represents the opinion of a very significant portion of the Palestinian people, should be included in the process of seeking a comprehensive settlement. It believes, however, that the PLO's opportunity to engage productively in such a process is limited, and perhaps non-existent, while it persists in denying Israel's right to exist.

18. Australia does not object in principle to the observer of the PLO appearing before the Council. As will be clear, our objection is to the basis upon which this was proposed.

19. Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): The Danish delegation abstained in the vote on the proposal of participation of the PLO in the Council's debate. In doing so, my delegation was guided by the rules of procedure which the Council has itself established. The procedure followed today is clearly designed to grant the PLO a status similar to that of a Member State. This does not reflect the true relationship of the PLO to the Organization, and, therefore, we cannot support it.

20. This does not mean, however, that my delegation objects to the PLO being heard by the Council during the present debate.

21. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The first speaker is the representative of Lebanon, on whom I now call.

22. Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) (*interpretation from Arabic*): First, on behalf of Lebanon and its people, I extend to the Soviet delegation, which represents a friendly country, and through it to the Soviet Government and people, our sincerest condolences on the passing of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

23. The increasing escalation of Israeli practices is confirmed hour by hour. These practices are becoming ever more barbaric as time goes on, but anyone who thought that our determination would be shaken and that we would yield our positions would be badly mistaken.

24. This very morning, Israeli forces launched a large-scale raid against the village of Zarrariye, north of the Litani River, in the region from which Israel had withdrawn a few weeks ago and where there is still a small unit of the Lebanese army. The first information we have received on this matter is that the Israeli forces encircled the village with a large number of tanks and troop-transport vehicles and proceeded to bomb the village, entered it and captured 24 of its inhabitants, mowing them down by gunfire before the very eyes of their families. These forces also opened fire on the Lebanese unit which was defending the village and its inhabitants. A number of soldiers were wounded; others were arrested. The inhabitants joined the Lebanese soldiers in defending their village against the Israeli aggressor.

25. These battles are continuing. Naval units of the Israeli forces are continuing to bombard neighbouring villages along the Lebanese coast, north of Saida.

26. This escalation undertaken by Israeli forces is a most serious matter. Massacre follows massacre in Lebanese villages. There are no means to dissuade the Israeli forces. If they continue their escalation, if they continue to flout the provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949[1] and the conventions on human rights, if they continue to cross the Litani River and to enter the region and engage in their inhumane practices against the Lebanese army and villages, how can we be sure that this withdrawal is indeed a genuine withdrawal, as these forces state? How can we ensure the safety of our inhabitants? How can we protect their property and their rights?

27. Israel has embarked on an escalation of its barbaric acts. This will have disastrous consequences that will turn against Israel itself. How long will the Council remain a silent witness to these barbaric acts? At least once, the Council should show that it can meet its responsibilities and that it is worthy of the confidence placed in it.

28. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): It was with deep sorrow that we learned this morning of the passing away of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. His death is a profound loss to the Government and people of that great country as well as to all those who had valued his contribution to world peace and held high expectations of his taking an even greater role in international security, particularly in the field of disarmament. On behalf of my delegation, therefore, I join in the expression of condolences to the people and Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, to its Mission and to the bereaved family.

29. My delegation has been following with serious concern the disturbing news reports of recent days indicating brutal reprisals by Israeli forces against the civilian population in southern Lebanon. Such actions as wanton killings without due process of law, demolition of homes and other measures going beyond any pretext of military necessity appear to violate in particular the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in time of War, of 12 August 1949.[2]

30. For humanitarian reasons, the Convention necessarily places strict obligations on the occupying Power which exercises authority in the area. It is therefore incumbent on Israel to satisfy the international community on these concerns and to desist from any such actions. To all intents and purposes, the Israeli representative, in his statement before the Council the other day [*2568th meeting*], has not satisfied my delegation's concern in this regard. On the contrary, our concern has been heightened by the serious repercussions which the inhumane actions, as long as they continue, will likely have on the peace and international security in the area. Recent incidents at Ma'rakah

are bound to inflame emotions and exacerbate tension even further.

31. Thailand's position on the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 is clear on this matter. We condemn all practices and measures against the civilian population in southern Lebanon which are in violation of its provisions.

32. It is also clear that the root cause of the bloodshed and suffering in this instance is the continuing illegal occupation of Lebanese territory by Israeli forces. This occupation, in turn, has led to mounting resistance on the part of the Lebanese. It is therefore necessary to eliminate this root cause in order to spare all parties further bloodshed and suffering. It is for this reason that my delegation is gratified to learn of the completion of the first phase of the Israeli withdrawal and the commencement of the second phase. With the increasing difficulties, there is even greater urgency that the total withdrawal of Israeli forces to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon be accomplished expeditiously and in an uninterrupted manner.

33. Thailand's basic position can be summed up as follows. Firstly, Lebanon's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity must be respected by all parties concerned. My delegation therefore supports the efforts of the Lebanese Government to extend its authority over all of its territory. Secondly, there must be no interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon. To ensure this, all foreign forces must withdraw from Lebanon, unless the Lebanese Government, in the exercise of its sovereign right, chooses otherwise. Thirdly, all relevant resolutions of the Council must be implemented without undue delay. Fourthly, disputes must be settled by peaceful means, taking into account the legitimate concerns of the parties.

34. While withdrawal is under way, the civilian population, including the Palestinian refugees, must be spared from repressive measures. It is sad enough that they are caught in the crossfire; it is worse when they are subjected to organized actions by the occupying forces. When the Israeli representative said before the Council that the Israeli authorities would use every means to stop the killings, we hope he meant the killings on both sides. Is it not worse for all concerned to leave feelings of bitter enmity and humiliation in the aftermath of the withdrawal which is now under way?

35. Part of the present difficulties stem from the lack of agreed arrangements which would ensure security, particularly for the civilian population, in the absence of impartial monitoring and protection. Its safety would certainly be enhanced if there were agreed arrangements between the parties directly involved. For that reason, we regret the breakdown in the Naqoura talks.

36. At this delicate stage, the increasing difficulties appear to complicate the withdrawal process and exacerbate the plight of the civilians, thereby prolonging their anguish. My delegation therefore joins in the appeal for a resumption of the Naqoura talks as soon as possible. We hope that an agreement can be reached to enable the Israeli withdrawal to proceed unimpeded with an expeditious timetable. In this connection, my delegation greatly appreciates the initiatives and efforts of the Secretary-General and his representative, as well as their ongoing good offices, to have the talks resumed. Consequently, we note with regret the absence of any reference to this important point in the draft resolution before the Council [*S/17000*].

37. The Thai delegation sees continuing usefulness for the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), despite changes in the situation. It may perhaps be said with some justification that, because of recent developments, there is greater necessity for the continuation of its mandate. Both the contributing Governments and the men themselves deserve our gratitude for the sacrifices they have to bear, pending the final resolution of the conflict. It should, therefore, be a matter of serious concern to the Council to enhance the safety of the forces in the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations who are caught in the present situation. My delegation has learned with dismay that a threat has been made against some of them because of their nationalities and the positions that their Governments—which represent sovereign member States—take in the Council.

38. It is therefore desirable, from the point of view of my delegation, that the Council take an initiative with a view to alleviating this concern and deploring any threat of violence against any member State in the exercise of its prerogatives in the Council.

39. We also note with regret the absence of any specific reference to UNIFIL in the draft resolution before the Council.

40. Regarding that draft resolution, my delegation's view, based on the foregoing statement of Thailands's basic position, is as follows. Firstly, my delegation's strong preference is for either a consensus resolution or a statement of the President which would also require a consensus, since we regard the issue at hand as one of humanitarian concern to all. Secondly, since my delegation believes that at this delicate juncture the interests of all parties would be better served if the total withdrawal of Israeli forces to the international border of Lebanon were accomplished without interruption or undue delay, it has reservations on the wording of some paragraphs of the draft resolution. In particular, in the first operative paragraph the Council should condemn all practices and measures against the civilian population that are in violation of international law and the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949.

41. Consequently, my delegation would prefer not to have the draft resolution pressed to the vote. However, this is unfortunately not the case, and the issue under consideration is limited to the situation in the areas occupied by Israel. In view of Thailand's basic position, and with the foregoing observations and reservations on record, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

42. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, observer of the League of Arab States, to whom the Council has extended an invitation, in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, at its 2568th meeting. I invite him to take a place as the Council table and to make his statement.

43. Mr. MAKSOUD: I should like at the outset to join in the universal condolences to the Soviet delegation on the untimely departure of Konstantin Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and General Secretary of the Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Needless to say, the League of Arab States as an organization and the entire Arab people share in the grief, and they wish that the new leadership in the Soviet Union will continue the commitment to the interests of peace, international security and development.

44. We have just heard the representative of Lebanon speak about the latest escalation in the situation in Lebanon by the Israeli occupation army. I just want to read out what has been stated by the Israelis today:

> "The Lebanese army was told not to interfere with the IDF"—the so-called Israeli Defence Force—"action. And only after they fired at our troops were they shot at and 10 of their soldiers detained."

45. This might sound like a routine statement; yet it entails a large measure of indications of what the Israeli position in southern Lebanon is. What it is is that the Lebanese army, exercising its full sovereign prerogatives in part of its territory to defend its own lands against Israeli actions which are in violation of Lebanese sovereignty, of Security Council resolutions and of the Charter of the United Nations, is challenged, on its own territory, by the Israeli army of occupation. The Israeli army states emphatically that the Lebanese army interrupted its action. The question is: does the Lebanese army have the right to interrupt Israeli action on territory that belongs to Lebanon?—a very simple question, perhaps not even necessary to repeat.

46. Yet what we are faced with, in Israeli semantics, is that they can render the most elementary and obvious facts—obvious legally recognized rights—as controversial, debatable and discussable, so that we who are on the side of the aggrieved party appear to be repetitious and redundant, continuing to insist on what should have been solved a long time ago. This is a technique utilized by Israel repeatedly in order to make what is obvious and elementary—the rights of Lebanon—something debatable and controversial, at least for Israel itself and those who support it.

47. We are also faced with semantic acrobatics in regard to a very elementary situation. All of a sudden people in the south of Lebanon resisting occupation—as every decent human being does when faced with occupation—are called terrorists. Israel repeats the word and the description "terrorist", and it conditions the reflexes so that after a certain time, when we seek to assert what is elementary, it again becomes controversial and the need arises—at that particular moment—for "even-handed and balanced attitudes". It is very easy for Israel to subject every objective reality to controversy and thus make objective reality no longer elementary but debatable. Thereby Israel seeks, unfortunately, to persuade certain Member States that what is required is an objective approach that equates Israel, the aggressor, with the victims of aggression. It is a technique which the international body has not, fortunately, succumbed to, but the device is utilized in order to paralyse the emerging consensus in the Council. To ascribe to the resistance movement in Lebanon—a movement which is one of the most glorious expressions of national commitment—the term "terrorist" puts the resistance in the noble category of many previous resistance movements and national liberation movements that were described by racists and colonialists as terrorists. So whether they are called terrorists by the Israelis or not is fundamentally and historically immaterial, because resistance in the south of Lebanon is in the same historical tradition as all the liberation movements that have led to the universal character and representation of this body of the United Nations.

48. Furthermore, the Israeli representative stated before the Council, without even batting an eyelid, that "there are certain basic assumptions sovereign States accept and expect from one another" [*2568th meeting, para. 69*].

49. When you hear this, at face value it is obvious that it is a correct statement, but when it comes from Israel it is very interesting to ask over what territories Israel exercises sovereignty. Has Israel—from its inception until today—ever been on record as able to clarify and define the parameters of its sovereignty so that others would not encroach upon it? So to claim judiciously that sovereign States have sovereign rights, in order that they will not be encroached upon it is important that the Council be able to extract from Israel a definition of the territorial parameters over which it claims sovereignty.

50. Conversely, Israel is in obvious violation of the sovereignty of many Arab States: of Egypt in Tabah, of Syria in the Golan Heights, of the Palestinian territory on the West Bank, in Jerusalem and Gaza—and in Lebanon, which is the primary subject of this debate. The sovereignty of Lebanon has been violated repeatedly since 1978 and before by Israel. And here we come to a central issue which has been frequently raised in this debate—why the Naqoura talks on military arrangements have not resumed.

51. The answer is very clear, very obvious: Israel remains unwilling to determine the timetable for its withdrawal in compliance with Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), the latter of which demands that it should withdraw forthwith from all occupied Lebanese territories.

52. The Naqoura talks have been envisaged as a modality through which implementation of the timetable would take place and the arrangements for the withdrawals would be made palatable at the lowest human costs. Instead, Israel

declared that it wanted to withdraw, made certain logistical arrangements and withdrew from certain territories because of the costs that had been inflicted by the resistance to its occupation. But then there arose its internal dilemma: the desire of one of the so-called coalition partners to have a visible result in the south of Lebanon so as to absolve Israel from the crime of its invasion of Lebanon, and the desire of the other part of the coalition to satisfy an emerging opposition to the continued Israeli occupation of Lebanon. So the equivocation on the part of Israel on withdrawing fully and forthwith from Lebanon is a projection of the internal dilemma and contradiction, at the expense of human life in southern Lebanon.

53. Then we are told that Israel has declared its intention to withdraw and that this should be taken at face value. The answer to that is that in 1978 a historical precedent was established whereby declared its withdrawal from Lebanon, and instead of allowing the legitimate Government of Lebanon to exercise its full authority and deploy its army in the south of Lebanon, it sought, through the extension of its mercenary forces, to maintain Lebanon's sovereignty as a fiction and introduced what I have repeatedly called the notion of Lebanon's "suspended sovereignty" over the south of Lebanon. This "suspended sovereignty" was a prescription for the subsequent Israeli invasion into Lebanon in 1982.

54. That explains the insistence of the Lebanese Government that those who are keen on the resumption of the Naqoura talks must realize that in 1978 Lebanon experienced the trauma of a fictional withdrawal and an actual occupation. The resumption of the Naqoura talks is a desirable objective of many of the Members of the Council, as it is for the legitimate Lebanese authorities. However, because of that precedent and because of the dangers it has imposed and the prescription it gave for renewed invasion, a clearly spelled-out timetable has become an absolute necessity for a credible outcome of resumed Naqoura talks between the Lebanese and the Israelis within the framework of the United Nations.

55. Israel cannot digest the fact that every action on the part of Lebanon emerges from exercise of its sovereign prerogatives, and it persists in its argument that those who are exercising resistance in the south of Lebanon are either fanatics, religious zealots or something else. It seems that Israel cannot understand the obvious, the immediacy and spontanaeity with which any decent human being rebels against the coerciveness of occupation. Israel does not understand, as Mr. Rabin has stated—when he said the genie had been exploded—that human beings, in asserting their equality and dignity, refuse to be humiliated, that humiliation is a prescription for insurrection and revolt, and that these have been determined by all to be legitimate pursuits when occupation arrogates to itself the right to perpetuate itself.

56. Furthermore, when Israel states that it wants to withdraw in form, yet retains for itself the right to strike and "to retaliate", it means that it wants to keep the south of Lebanon hostage to its military, strategic and, if possible, political hegemony. This is an attempt on the part of Israel to persuade the international community that it seeks to withdraw from the south of Lebanon while it maintains for itself the "inherent" right to encroach on the sovereignty of Lebanon at any moment it so desires. It does so, of course, under the pretense that it is acting in self-defence.

57. I do not want to go into all the origins of this technique and this theory, which is dangerous. The Charter of the United Nations was based on the assumption that retaliation, massive and otherwise, violates international order and the prospects of international security. What is more, Israel states that it is hurt when Beirut voices concern when it is a matter that concerns Israel.

58. We must once and for all ease that hurt. Beirut is the capital of a sovereign State, Lebanon. Lebanon is a founder member of the League of Arab States. Lebanon is an Arab country. Therefore, it is part and parcel of the overall Arab commitment to the sovereignty of Arab States and to the rights of the Palestinians to self-determination. The attempt to describe Lebanon as Arab because of duress or, as the Israelis have repeatedly said, because of Syria, flies in the face of historical reality, national commitment and human decency, because Lebanon, like Syria, has contributed and will continue to contribute to the Arab national, intellectual and cultural renaissance.

59. Furthermore, any violation by Israel of Lebanon is a matter for instant reaction. It is surprising that Israel allows itself to confront the Lebanese army, as if to say that the Lebanese army is permissive towards the "terrorists". Israel does not understand the mood of the Lebanese army, the Lebanese Government and the people in the south of Lebanon. It does not perceive that the army, the Government and those people are all an integral part of a genuine national resistance.

60. The Israeli representative told the Council: "As for Israel, we do not have to justify to anyone" [*ibid., para. 78*]. That is the crux not only of a statement made in debate but of a basic attitude of mind, an ideological determination to confront anybody, any institution, any resolution, any mechanism that seeks to contain and curtail an entity that is in a state of defiance and that rejects as a matter of ideological commitment any form of accountability for any of its violations, any of its conquests, any of its acts of aggression, any of its acts of annexation.

61. "As for Israel, we do not have to justify to anyone." What does it not have to justify? The answer to that question is the documented violations and inhumane practices that the Lebanese representative has clearly spelled out, not only today but throughout the debate. Are not the questions and inquiries of the members of the Council worthy of a response from Israel? Are not they worthy of its giving an answer other than automatic rejection?

62. The statement "We do not have to justify to anyone" is dangerous because Israel is trying to establish a situation in which it becomes a loose cannon in interna-

tional relations, under international law, the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations.It is trying to put itself outside the pale of accountability that all Member States have accepted. It is trying to create a counter-legitimacy to this body's legitimacy. It is trying, in fact, to say "Take it or leave it. We are not accountable; we are not answerable."

63. The permissiveness enshrined in that attitude contains the seeds of much bigger acts of aggression, violations and threats to international peace and security. That approach is mind-boggling, especially on the part of an entity licensed by this very organization, the United Nations. In order to perpetuate its systematic, studied, ideological defiance of the international community, it uses the term "iron fist". It did not have to use the term "iron fist". We have seen the nature of its practices: the bulldozing of houses, the blowing up of people, the entry into hospitals—violation after violation, violations so frequent that one cannot cope with them.

64. When one thinks of the "iron fist" policy and the Israeli occupation, one asks by what right the Israeli army continues its presence in southern Lebanon. When practices described by everyone as violations of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949[2] are condemned, is it not time, as the representative of Lebanon asked, to take action to deter Israel and to give it an incentive to comply?

65. We are told that we must be realistic. We are told that conditions are not propitious at this moment for the United Nations to act decisively.

66. We were utterly amazed last week at what was said [*2570th meeting*] by the representative of the United States, with which Lebanon has historically maintained the closest relations ever since its independence. The two countries have the closest affinities. At this time of suffering being undergone by the Lebanese people, when scores of people in Lebanon are dying, the representative of the United States came before the Council to voice concern that would be understandable if it were part of a broader and deeper concern about Israel's practices in the south of Lebanon, the various violations that have taken place and the inhumanity of the Israeli occupation. But the representative of the United States excluded the concerns of Lebanon and the international community about what is happening in the south, and focused on three telephone calls. They were threatening, perhaps, but, however understandable that concern, I invite the representative of the United States to spend a day at one of the Arab offices in this city: she will hear some of the telephone threats that we receive at times. I am sure Member States represented in the Council have also received telephone threats.

67. Let us go further. Perhaps the United States, because of the tragedies that have taken place in Lebanon and other places, has to be even more vigilant. We can accept that. Vigilance of any country concerning its citizens is a prerogative—a matter of right and duty—and the Lebanese Government has given whatever it can give in the way of assurances and co-operation, for which the United States representative has expressed appreciation. My point is not the concern over the threats, because such concern is to be expected and is a duty. My concern is that it became almost the entire subject of the debate, almost the entire position of the United States on an issue that carries with it a great deal of concern and danger. Besides, it must be realized that the Lebanese people, as well as all other Arab peoples, has great respect for any citizen of any country working within the mechanism of the United Nations; and therefore, with due respect for the concern and with deep appreciation for such concern, we consider that it has been a digression to seek to project an entire position on a limited aspect of the concern, whether justified or not.

68. It is not for me to mention how much we appreciate the support we have received from the international community, especially that voiced here, concerning the plight of the Lebanese and of the Palestinian refugees in the camps. We would have preferred, however, that this body not be made the arena for ideological polemics with the Arab States, and we hope that the support we receive on this particular issue not be made conditional on sermonizing to the Arabs on how they should act. I should like to mention that the concern expressed in this Council over the prevalence of violence is a matter of deep and great concern for us. I think that all of us abhor violence. The sight on television every night of the removal of the twisted bodies of countless people, their faces distorted, touches the basic ethos, regardless of who they may have been, and it behooves us all to put an end to violence. It must be understood, however, that even the advocates of non-violence, such as Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King and others, described the limits of human patience to indignities, the parameters of humiliation. Non-violence is the preferred option of any resistance, but if non-violence means submissiveness to the occupier, then the violence of the occupation authorities is to be found not only in the destruction of houses, hospitals and fields or in the mutilation of bodies or in the death that is inflicted repeatedly and indiscriminately on civilian inhabitants—that is the more obvious form of violence—but when one discriminates, when one assumes and arrogates to oneself a superiority, the right to dominate, to occupy, to disqualify, to disenfranchise—that is a form of violence that strikes at the gut of every citizen and decent human being. That has been the texture of all revolutions. Therefore when the Council and the Lebanese delegation seek a halt to these acts, it is actually an investment in the future of peace, tranquillity and stability, because they are trying to defuse an unmanageable explosion of human indignity against the continued presence and defiance of Israeli occupation in southern Lebanon. Therefore objectivity is not an equidistant position between right and wrong, between the aggressor and the victims of aggression. Objectivity is measured historically by how much a position or a resolution can actually help to promote peace and effectively extirpate the seeds of violence.

69. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation was shocked to learn of the untimely passing of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, the outstanding leader of the Soviet Party and State and Presi-

dent of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. This is a major loss to the Soviet people. We wish to convey our deep condolences to the Soviet delegation and, through the delegation, to the bereaved family.

70. Recently the Israeli authorities mobilized a large number of troops, tanks and armoured vehicles in southern Lebanon, the west Bekaa and the Rashaya district in pursuit of the so-called iron-fist policy, launched a series of raids against peaceful villages and towns and arrested and suppressed civilians, resulting in heavy casualties and the destruction of many houses.

71. We have listened attentively to the three statements by Mr. Rachid Fakhoury, the representative of Lebanon at the 2567th, 2570th and the present meeting, in which he denounced with numerous facts the recent atrocities committed by Israeli troops and the heavy losses of life and property inflicted by them on the Lebanese people. The Israeli occupying troops have thus seriously trampled underfoot the provisions contained in the 1949 Geneva Conventions.[1]

72. It must be noted that certain "chieftains" of the Israeli occupying troops have even openly asserted that they "had not exhausted all the possibilities" in their suppressive measures and that they were going to take further actions of terror. As the memories of the tragic massacre of innocent civilians in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps in 1982 are still fresh, we cannot but worry about the recurrence of similar bloodshed.

73. By invading and prolonging their occupation of territories of Lebanon, the Israeli authorities have seriously violated the basic norms governing international relations and the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. No country whatsoever may invade neighbouring countries and forcibly occupy their territories under the pretext of ensuring its own security.

74. Israel must comply with the relevant Security Council resolutions, including the provisions of resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), and withdraw its troops from Lebanon immediately, completely and unconditionally. Under no pretext should Israel continue its occupation of southern Lebanon, pursue its "iron-fist" policy nor bully the local inhabitants. The actions taken by Israel have aggravated the situation in the region and constitute a grave threat to the peace and security of the region. This cannot but arouse the concern of the international community.

75. The Chinese delegation condemns the atrocities committed by Israel in southern Lebanon against the Lebanese people and supports the just propositions and reasonable demands put forward by the Government of Lebanon and the various demands contained in the communiqué adopted on 6 March by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries at its urgent session held in New York [*S/17008, annex*]. We hold that the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon must be respected, and that the Council should take action to check the wilful atrocities committed by Israel in the occupied Lebanese territories and make Israel implement without delay the relevant resolutions adopted by the Council and withdraw all its troops from Lebanon, so that the sacred rights of the Lebanese people to exercise sovereignty over their entire territory can be restored.

76. Mr. de KÉMOULARIA (France) (*interpretation from French*): First, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the President and my colleagues who have preceded me on the passing of President Chernenko. On my country's behalf, I extend to the representative of the Soviet Union our sincere condolences. A page of history has turned in his country. We would like him to know that we are aware of its importance and that we share in the Soviet Union's bereavement.

77. Once again the Council has met here on the request of the Lebanese Government to consider the situation in southern Lebanon. Indeed, that situation has become a matter of great concern, and it is the Council's duty immediately to give it all due attention.

78. The information that has been given us by the representative of Lebanon highlights the seriousness of these incidents, which have been growing more frequent in recent times, causing great loss of life and increasing the suffering of a population which is already sorely tried by all the events which have been taking place for years now in that region. We have continually advocated negotiation, and can only deplore acts of violence of any sort which cannot but make the search for peaceful solutions more difficult.

79. At the 2570th meeting, the United States delegation stressed that threats had been made against the United States in connection with this debate. We are surely unanimous in rejecting any form of external pressure, regardless of its nature, on one or more members of the Council that could violate the independence or the functioning of a principal body of the Organization.

80. As my predecessor stressed in the Council on 31 August 1984 [*2554th meeting*], Israel must respect international conventions on human rights which are applicable in cases of armed conflict. Like all States which have signed the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] Israel must scrupulously implement its provisions. There can be no loopholes here.

81. Armed Israeli forces—and we note this as a positive element—have begun their withdrawal. But that does not give them the right to attempt to hamper action undertaken by UNIFIL in strict application of Council resolution 523 (1982)—which, as we are all well aware, authorized the Force "to carry out . . . interim tasks in the humanitarian and administrative fields . . . and to assist the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the security of all the inhabitants of the area without any discrimination". In this respect, the Secretary-General stressed in his statement of 26 February that seven Israeli operations had recently taken place in the Force's zone of operation. We know that on several occasions there have been clashes between Israeli forces and UNIFIL elements—in particu-

lar, units supplied by my country—which were carrying out, within the framework of their instructions, a mission of peace and protection of civilian population. In our view, such incidents are deeply regrettable and contrary to the spirit in which peace-keeping operations undertaken by the Security Council should be carried out. The Council cannot allow the existence of such an attitude.

82. I take this opportunity to thank the Secretary-General for the tribute which he has paid to the dedication and actions of the French contingent.

83. It should certainly be possible to reduce the present tension considerably, thereby preventing the many resultant incidents, by returning to the negotiating table. We hope, in these circumstances, that the parties concerned will resume their talks in order to develop security arrangements which could make a real contribution to restoring calm, facilitate—indeed, hasten—the total withdrawal of Israeli forces, and finally permit a re-establishment in the region of the authority of the Lebanese Government. That would be a significant step forward in the action we are taking to help it to regain its sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity.

84. The Council knows that my Government's most ardent desire is for the establishment one day, not only in Lebanon, but throughout the region, of the lasting peace to which all the populations involved eagerly aspire.

85. Anxious to affirm its solidarity with Lebanon, which has been scourged for far too long, France—which, I repeat, wishes to see the immediate restoration of the territorial integrity and unity of that country, with which we have so many ties—while regretting that the amendments it proposed were not taken into account in the draft resolution before us [*S/17000*], which would without any question have made it possible to gain the broad support of the Council, will nevertheless vote in its favour.

86. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Democratic Yemen. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

87. Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Today, the world learned with shock of the passing of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This tremendous misfortune represents a loss to the whole of mankind, which in President Chernenko lost a prominent militant who had devoted his life to the strengthening of international peace and security and to support for peoples struggling for liberation, independence and independent social and economic development. We Arab peoples will never forget President Chernenko's tireless efforts throughout his life—and especially since his assumption of the leadership of the friendly Soviet Union—to strengthen cordial Arab-Soviet relations and to provide honest support for vital Arab causes, foremost among them the cause of the Arab people of Palestine.

88. On this sad occasion we convey our most sincere condolences to Mr. Troyanovsky, representative of the Soviet Union, to all members of the Soviet Mission, and to the representatives of the Byelorussian and Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republics and all the members of their Missions. Through them, we convey our condolences to the bereaved family and to the people and Government of the friendly Soviet Union.

89. We are confident that the great Soviet people will be capable of overcoming this tragedy and of continuing its struggle, as it has always done in the past.

90. From the beginning of this debate, the Council has heard statements by the representative of Lebanon in which he adduced hard facts to describe the suffering and tragedy of the Lebanese people, chafing under the yoke of Israeli occupation and subjected to continuing escalation of the terrorist acts and practices carried out against that people by the Israeli occupation authorities, in violation of the norms of international law and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] which apply to civilians in areas under occupation. Developments in the Arab region since the Israeli invasion of Lebanese territory have shown the inability of imperialist and Zionist circles to restore colonialist hegemony to the Arab region in the face of the growing heroic resistance and valiant struggle of the Lebanese people. Lebanon has come before the Council to stress the Council's responsibility to put an end to the Israeli occupation and aggression unleased against the Lebanese people. It has made clear, frank demands, namely for an end to the Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon, for total Israeli withdrawal from Lebanese territory, for implementation of resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), unanimously adopted by the Council, for condemnation of Israel, its practices and its policies in contravention of the norms of international law and agreements, in particular the fourth Geneva Convention, and for the immediate cessation of Israeli practices and operations against the populations of southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district.

91. Israel's aggressive policies and practices aimed against the Lebanese people and against the Palestinian camps in southern Lebanon must be considered together with identical policies and practices aimed against the Palestinian Arab people and the Syrian people whose territories are under Israeli occupation in the West Bank, the Gaza district, Jerusalem and the Golan Heights. It appears that the escalation of these policies and practices follows upon the heightened threat posed by the expansionist, aggressive policies of Zionism and imperialism, which are designed to push through capitulationist schemes and to undermine legitimate Arab causes and rights, foremost among them the cause of the Palestinian Arab people and the rights of that people to return to its homeland, to self-determination, and to the establishment of an independent national State on its own national soil.

92. Under these circumstances, with the peoples of our Arab region and our vital Arab causes facing Zionist and imperialist conspiracies and schemes, the heroic resistance

of the Lebanese people against Israeli occupation—which compelled the forces of occupation to withdraw after the Lebanese people thwarted the attempted conspiracy by the American Administration to impose the so-called 17 May 1983 agreement—is a fresh example of the vigilance of the Arab peoples, their refusal to capitulate, and their continuing struggle for their just, vital causes. That resistance is added to the record of resistance of the Syrian and Palestinian peoples against occupation and of struggle for the liberation of their territories.

93. Israel regards its expansion by force and aggression, as well as its seizing and annexing territories, as one of the component elements of its very being. To this end, it enjoys unlimited American economic, political and military support. This is especially true because the Zionist-American strategic alliance affirms the real approach of American imperialism in the area and confirms its encouragement of and support for the Zionists in their occupation of more Arab territories and their denial of the rights of the Palestinian Arab peoples. This is the explanation for Israel's disregard for the Council and for international law, as well as its failure to comply with the will of the international community that an end be put to its occupation of southern Lebanon and its colonialist policies and terrorist practices in the occupied territories. Why should Israel not continue these practices when it enjoys the full protection of the exercise of the United States veto in the Security Council? This has rendered the Council unable to shoulder its responsibilities.

94. Democratic Yemen, while reiterating its solidarity with the Lebanese people in their struggle to put an end to the Israeli occupation and to preserve the unity of Lebanon and its Arab identity, regards the demands made by the representative of Lebanon as just demands, which the Council must take immediate action to implement, thereby affirming the credibility of its resolutions and its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Dare we entertain the hope that it will indeed do so?

95. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Cuba. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

96. Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to express to our colleague, Mr. Troyanovsky, and to all the members of the Soviet mission my heartfelt and deepest condolences on the passing of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, Konstantin Chernenko.

97. Mr. President, we are very pleased to see you, the representative of a worthy African country with which mine has close bonds of friendship, presiding over the deliberations of the Council this month. We are convinced that your wisdom, experience and diplomatic skills ensure that the Council will successfully carry out its work during the month of March.

98. We express our gratitude also to your predecessor, Mr. Krishnan, representative of one of our friends, India, for the very skilful and fair way in which he conducted the work of the Council in February.

99. For some time now the Council and other United Nations bodies have been considering the situation arising from Israel's criminal invasion and subsequent occupation of part of the territory of a State Member of the Organization, Lebanon, a country known historically for its peaceful traditions.

100. In spite of the many resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly, and in spite of the statements and decisions of many other international forums, particularly the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, we are once again obliged to turn to the Council for further consideration of the criminal actions that the Israeli occupation forces have been carrying out against Lebanese civilians.

101. These events have aroused the indignation of world public opinion and have been vigorously condemned by the Member States that cherish peace and justice.

102. In this connection, my Government's position has been set forth in a statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which, with your permission and that of the other members of the Council, I shall now read out:

> "Reports from Lebanon inform us about genocidal acts that have been carried out by Zionist occupation troops of Israel against the people of southern Lebanon. We received information daily about the establishment of curfews, the destruction of the homes of peaceful inhabitants, the detention of inhabitants in concentration camps, indiscriminate attacks by artillery, aircraft and troops against civilians, and the unleashing of brutal repression against the inhabitants of the region of southern Lebanon.
>
> "These criminal actions are an alarming indication that the Zionists are planning to perpetuate their control over this part of Lebanon and to create a 'buffer State', as originally envisaged in their plans for the invasion known as 'Peace for Galilee' launched in June 1982.
>
> "The continued pressure exerted on the occupation forces by the resistance of the patriotic and progressive Lebanese forces has obliged Israel to carry out partial withdrawals. The strength of the patriotic resistance has stymied the Israeli army, which has engaged in reprisals, terrorizing and killing civilians.
>
> "Once again the Israeli Government, with the support of its strategic ally, the United States, is showing its complete scorn for the most elementary rules of international life, brazenly and openly infringing the rights of the Lebanese people, flagrantly violating the Charter of the United Nations and all the resolutions of the Security Council, which require immediate and unconditional withdrawal from the occupied Lebanese territories, and once again trampling underfoot Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

"This escalation of aggression greatly increases the danger that another war will break out in the region, placing international peace and security at risk.

"The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Cuba vigorously condemns these crimes against humanity committed by the Zionist occupation forces and calls the attention of world public opinion to the overriding necessity of stopping these reprehensible actions and preventing Israel from slaughtering with impunity the courageous and heroic Lebanese and their legitimate patriotic resistance."

103. Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The people of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, like all the peoples of the Soviet Union, profoundly regret the passing away of Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The name of that outstanding figure of the Communist Party and of the Soviet State will remain forever enshrined in the memory of our people. The entire life and activities of Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko were dedicated to serving the interests of the Soviet people, to resolving major economic and social problems in the development of the country and to advancing the struggle for ending the arms race and eliminating the threat of nuclear war in order to ensure the security of peoples.

104. The Ukrainian delegation shares the concern regarding the continuing tragedy in southern Lebanon, which has been occupied by the Israeli military clique. The facts cited in the statements of the representative of Lebanon and the alarming information in the reports received daily from the area attest to the extremely dangerous situation in the occupied southern part of the country and reaffirm how right the Government of that country was to turn to the Council for help.

105. The Ukrainian people languished under the yoke of Hitlerite occupation for a number of years and had to endure all the ensuing terrible consequences. Our people, like all the brotherly peoples of the Soviet Union which bore the burdens of deprivation and suffering of the Second World War, and which made a decisive contribution to defeating Hitlerite fascism and to achieving a historic victory—of which the fortieth anniversary will be widely celebrated in May by all progressive mankind—shares in and understands the suffering of the Lebanese and other Arab peoples in the continuing occupation of their ancestral lands.

106. For almost three years now, the Israeli military clique has been committing abuses on part of Lebanese territory occupied as a result of the aggression of 1982. Since that time, the wave of terror and violence directed at the Lebanese and Palestinians has for all practical purposes not slackened for a single day. By mobilizing infantry and tank units to carry out punitive operations, the Israeli invaders have blockaded towns and villages, carrying out general searches, round-ups and arrests, subjecting peaceful civilians to humiliations, torture, indignities and beatings. During recent days, the scale of mass punitive operations has become particularly cruel, and their extent has once again been pointed out today in the statement of the representative of Lebanon.

107. Numerous facts cited during meetings of the Council with absolute clarity attest to the crude violation by Israel, the occupying Power, of the relevant norms of international humanitarian law, the Charter of the United Nations and the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] and the Regulations annexed to the Hague Convention IV respecting the laws and customs of war on land, of 1907.[3] These actions are in violation of the relevant decisions of the Council, in particular of the unanimously adopted resolutions 512 (1982) and 513 (1982).

108. There can be no doubt that the aggressor would not behave so insolently and provocatively were it not for the comprehensive assistance and support of the United States.

109. Suffice it to recall that on 6 September 1984 [*2556th meeting*], the United States blocked the adoption by the Council of a draft resolution [*S/16732*] which, in view of the existing serious situation, represented the bare minimum, calling as it did on Israel to comply strictly with the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 *vis-à-vis* the civilian population of southern Lebanon.

110. Those same forces are to blame for the fact that Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which were adopted with their participation, remain unimplemented—the latter demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli forces to the internationally recognized borders of Lebanon, a most important prerequisite for a settlement of the situation in Lebanon.

111. Firmly condemning the continuing Israeli occupation of the territory of Lebanon and the most recent wave of terror and acts of oppression directed against the civilian population in southern Lebanon, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic believes that the Council must condemn the abuses of the Israeli occupiers, demand an immediate unconditional and total withdrawal of Israeli troops from that country in accordance with its resolution 509 (1982), and ensure compliance by the aggressor with the norms of international humanitarian law regarding the civilian population of the occupied territory. It is necessary to ensure respect for the territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon and to put an end to the arbitrary will and violence of the Israeli occupiers concerning the civilian population, including the Palestinian refugees in the camps. A demand for the immediate implementation of these measures is also made in the communiqué adopted on 6 March 1985 by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at its urgent session, held in New York [*S/17008, annex*].

112. As to the concern expressed in the Council over Israel's activities with regard to UNIFIL, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR supports the proposal made in the

course of the current debate to have the Secretary-General regularly inform the Council with regard to all cases where there are obstacles to United Nations forces carrying out their functions in that area.

113. It is perfectly obvious that consideration of the Lebanese problem in isolation from the general explosive situation in the Middle East is impossible. In this connection, we fully support the proposals made on 29 July 1984 by the Soviet Union concerning a Middle East settlement [*S/16685, annex*] as the basis for the search for a comprehensive and just settlement ensuring peace and security for all States and peoples of the region.

114. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR supports the draft resolution sponsored by Lebanon in document S/17000.

115. Mr. LUNA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I should like to extend to the people and the Government of the Soviet Union the heartfelt condolences of the Government of Peru on the decease of Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

116. In the current debate which has led to the convening of the Council for the second time in the past six months as a result of new complaints by Lebanon concerning events affecting the civilian population in southern Lebanon, the delegation of Peru would like at the outset to express its sincere and profound solidarity with Lebanon, which has long been the victim of circumstances and events representing not only a tragedy but also outrageous and cruel abuse of a State Member of the United Nations, a country whose efforts and undeniable valour my country much admires and respects.

117. As the Secretary-General warned some time ago, the situation has now worsened significantly and reached levels going beyond the survival, the dignity and the respect for the human rights of the inhabitants of the region and the minimum requirements for the peace and security of the area.

118. As it has already stated, my delegation confirms its determined support for Lebanon in these serious circumstances. We hope that, with the support of the other members of the Council, a way will soon be found leading to the immediate restoration to the people and the Government of Lebanon of their right to real independence and sovereignty, and consequently, to the full exercise of authority throughout their territory, thus guaranteeing the preservation of their integrity and unity. I therefore wish to reaffirm our support for the resolutions adopted by the Council on this subject, specifically resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982).

119. Within the general framework of our moral and legal obligations, I wish to state that for Peru it is a matter of the greatest priority at this time that we should develop the precarious machinery for a dialogue between the parties and work for the effective and speedy resumption of contacts between the military authorities in order to complete the withdrawal process already under way, so as effectively to guarantee the human rights of the civilian population in keeping with the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[2] If this is not attained—and it cannot fail to be an aim shared by the international community—the present critical situation could worsen even more radically, jeopardizing any potential *rapprochement* or initiative aimed at disentangling the complex situation in the Middle East.

120. The draft resolution before us [*S/17000*] refers to the situation in which the civilian population of southern Lebanon finds itself. For practical and constructive reasons we would have preferred the text to have referred more clearly to the objective of finding, even now, the minimal machinery to stabilize and systematize the process of withdrawal of the occupying forces. We sincerely believe that if there had been a specific reference to this subject, the text would have been less narrow and the situation could have become less dramatic and violent than it is at present.

121. As regards certain aspects of the drafting of the text, my delegation believes that, although in this specific case we have not heard any denial of the complaints made by Lebanon, condemnations should be in keeping with facts that are suitably corroborated at the international level.

122. On the other hand, I cannot fail to state most clearly that my Government has noted the concern voiced by the representative of the United States [*2570th meeting*] with regard to blackmail by certain obscure extremist groups, in a crude attempt to influence that country's vote on the current problem. In so far as that raises pressure and violence to unheard of dimensions in this now nearly anarchic international system, and is an attempt to bring terrorism into this principal mechanism for collective security of the international community, it is the duty of each State individually and of the United Nations as a whole to reject that attempt categorically.

123. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now speak in my capacity as the representative of MADAGASCAR.

124. On the occasion of the death of President Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko, I wish officially to reiterate the profound condolences of my delegation to the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to read out the message sent by Mr. Didier Ratsiraka, the President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as follows:

> "It is with great regret that the Malagasy people, the institutions of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar and I myself learned the sad news of the death of President Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. I therefore wish to express our sincerest condolences on the cruel

loss of this eminent Soviet statesman, Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. His work has come to an end at a crucial time for the future of peace in the world and at a time of great distress for the third world. History will long remember him as a man of principle who, throughout his life, constantly worked to bring peoples together, to achieve equitable international co-operation and above all to safeguard the fragile edifice of peace."

That message fully reflects the feelings of my delegation at this time.

125. Resuming consideration of the item on the agenda, I wish to make the following statement.

126. It is difficult to give a more faithful, more convincing and more moving account of Israeli actions in southern Lebanon, the region of the western Bekaa and the district of Rashaya than was done by the representative of Lebanon in his statements before the Council on 28 February and 7 March [*2568th and 2570th meetings*] and today. Everything, or almost everything, has already been said about sweeps, encircling operations, meticulous investigations, house-by-house searches, destruction, the placing of plastic explosives, the desecration of houses of worship, the rounding up of people, massacres and the brutal, humiliating and inhuman treatment meted out to the Lebanese civilian population by the Israeli armed forces.

127. Powerless, or perhaps indifferent, we hear the long list of names of villages such as Aaichiye, Arab Salim, Bazuriyah, Burj-Rahhal, Ma'rakeh, Rihane, Qusayeh, Sir El-Gharbiyah, Shaqra, Kfa-Dounin, Qabrikha, Taura, Jib Jannin, Kamid Al-Loz, Tair Dibbah, Deir Mimas, Kfar Kila, Qar'oon, Deir Kanoun, El-Nahr and many more, without really appreciating the horrors experienced by the population under the iron rod of Tsahal.

128. And yet this is not deceitful or ill-intentioned propaganda. Reporters from *The Washington Post* and ABC radio have borne witness to it. Western observers have reported on it. Members of relief organizations and of UNIFIL have confirmed it. Some of them, French and Finnish, have been accused of wanting to impede Tsahal's action against what people have conveniently called terrorists. The area occupied by Israel has become a real battlefield—for an unequal battle between civilian populations and highly trained and over-armed occupiers—and the international community is denied the right to condemn this and to demand its immediate cessation.

129. In the circumstances, Israel puts forward three arguments: the first is that it will not hesitate to resort to the most extreme methods to protect its soldiers' lives; the second, that it cannot be held responsible for dissent among Lebanese communities; and the third, that it is only a question of Shiite terrorists. It does this in the hope of reconciling certain opinions whose connivance with neo-nazism and neo-fascism is all too familiar.

130. Thus only the lives of the soldiers in the Tsahal count, and we must now forget the obligations of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[2] But what about its article 27, which prohibits physical and moral assaults upon civilians in occupied territories? What about article 30, which gives all facilities to civilian populations, enabling them to turn to the International Committee of the Red Cross for assistance? And what about article 31, banning any physical or moral coercion of civilians to obtain information from them? What of article 53, forbidding the destruction of personal and real property belonging individually or collectively to individuals in occupied territory? What of article 55, according to which the occupying Power has the duty of ensuring the provision of food and medical supplies of the population? And finally, what about article 29, according to which the occupying Power is held fully responsible for any mistreatment of local populations by its armed forces? We do not believe that the repeated, systematic and flagrant violation of these articles constitutes self-defence.

131. The Israeli occupier has given its armed forces *carte blanche* to oppress and repress the nationalists whose duty is to oppose the occupation by all means. We have heard here reports from many delegations as to the meaning of the resistance. Israel knew full well that the Shiite opposition in that area has always been very strong, so strong that it called the arc of resistance "villages of hate". But what can be expected from populations that are victims of unlawful occupation, therefore of aggression? Must they applaud? Must they collaborate? Must they allow themselves to be manipulated by those who are at the orders and in the pay of the occupiers? In voting unanimously in favour of resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), we all recognized that Israel's occupation of part of Lebanon was illegal, and those of us who have had the sorry experience of occupation will surely agree that resistance is legitimate, and that the origin of the cycle of violence must be sought elsewhere than in Lebanese resistance.

132. Turning now to the argument that any Israeli operation in Lebanon is in one way or another linked to the security of the Israeli populations on the border, we would remind the Council that according to international law the protection of the civilian population of a State takes place within the boundaries of that State, and that no country can, under that pretext, invade another country or interfere in another country's internal affairs. Israel's "iron fist" policy, instead of suppressing resistance, has only encouraged it, and certain circles say that this could provoke the Shiite resistance to shoot at villages in Galilee and to justify the maintainance of Tsahal beyond the internationally recognized borders of Lebanon.

133. Thus we arrive at this paradox: that Lebanon, and in particular the civilian populations of southern Lebanon, in western Bekaa and the Rashaya district, have basically become victims of the controversy in Israeli political circles between those favouring total withdrawal and those who, grudgingly, have accepted a phased redeployment.

134. Our conclusions, which concur with those put forward in the communiqué adopted on 6 March by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned

Countries at its urgent meeting in New York [*S/17008, annex*] are as follows.

135. Israel has deliberately placed itself outside international law and has engaged in reprehensible acts in occupied Lebanese territory.

136. Lebanon, regardless of the regional political context, was right in bringing the question to the Council and demanding that justice be done, as is called for in the draft resolution in document S/17000.

137. After our adoption of resolutions 425 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), we have an obligation to condemn Israel's present practices in occupied Lebanese territory and to demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel's occupying forces from Lebanon. Otherwise it will be vain to speak of strict respect for the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of that Member State.

138. I now resume my functions as PRESIDENT.

139. The next speaker is the representative of Jordan. I invite him to take a place as the Council table and to make his statement.

140. Mr. KASRAWI (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset I should like to convey to the Soviet delegation our profound condolences on the occasion of the death of President Konstantin Chernenko, President of the Supreme Soviet and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We share the general distress at the loss of one of the champions of international détente and of *rapprochement*. We should be grateful if our condolences could be forwarded to the Government and people of that friendly country the Soviet Union and to the bereaved family.

141. The Council is meeting to resume its discussion of Lebanon's complaint against Israel, which is justified by the tyranny, high-handedness and brutality of the Israeli occupation forces, which commit daily—with impunity—arbitrary actions and oppressive practices against the civilian population of the areas under Israeli occupation. The representative of Lebanon has sketched in the Council, with considerable supporting evidence, a tragic picture of the great hardship and suffering inflicted on the Lebanese population, which, under the heel of the Israeli occupation, has suffered a whole range of atrocities, including arrests, murder, humiliation, mass punishment, the encircling of villages and towns by the Israeli army and indiscriminate firing upon the people and their houses.

142. Each day the violence reaches new peaks, even to the point where places of worship and hospitals are not safe, despite their inviolability enshrined in all international norms and conventions. Since the meeting of the Council on 28 February [*2568th meeting*], the Israeli arbitrary actions have been intensified. Members of the Council have become aware of the details of those actions, thanks to the letters from the representative of Lebanon, particularly that of 4 March [*S/16997*], which describes an example of Israel's repressive policy in the town of Ma'rakah. Israeli forces surrounded and raided this town, where they blew up its mosque, with 15 people killed and 45 wounded, and blasted four houses.

143. The latest of these repressive acts was committed on this very day, when Israeli forces raided the village of Al-Zararich in southern Lebanon, with the result that 24 people were killed.

144. The Israeli policy of collective punishment of the civilian population of the occupied Lebanese regions is merely an extension of the policy pursued by the occupying forces in the West Bank, Gaza and the Golan Heights ever since they occupied those territories in 1967. The Israeli military forces have committed those actions against the civilian population only because those populations resist the occupation. The world recently witnessed an intensification of that policy in occupied southern Lebanon, to the point where the only choice for Lebanon, which has endured intolerable sufferings, was recourse to the Council, in the hope that the Council could find a way to deter Israel from continuing its campaign of repression against the Lebanese people.

145. Israel has harboured a perception of its security founded on the use of force that can extend to the territory of neighbouring States and, where necessary, the occupation of those territories, believing that such acts can assure Israeli security. However, Israel has forgotten that the denial of other people's rights and the occupation of their territories which accompanies application of that perception leads to fierce resistance and rejection of its policy and its occupation.

146. The Lebanese experience has made it clear that that special theory of security has been a failure. Its implementation in Lebanon has cost Israel dear; it has led to the absence of a just and lasting peace in the region. The Council has again affirmed that Israel must withdraw from Lebanon and has called for complete and unconditional withdrawal from all the occupied Lebanese territories, as set out in its resolution 509 (1982). Israel has trampled underfoot the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] which forbids occupying forces to carry out policies of terrorization, retaliation and collective punishment of the population, such policies have impelled Lebanon to have recourse to the Council, asking it to take measures to stop those acts of brutality against the civilian population and to compel Israel to implement Council resolutions calling for its complete withdrawal from occupied territories.

147. Lebanon's request is perfectly just. Lebanon is thereby attempting to restore its sovereignty over all its territory and to put an end to all those practices which so gravely endanger its sovereignty and security. The inhabitants of the country, whether Lebanese or Palestinian, have endured more hardship than anyone in the world. The Lebanese request is in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations resolutions on Lebanon previously adopted by the Council. It is incumbent on the Council to

do its moral and political duty in response to the just and legitimate Lebanese requests.

148. Events that have taken place since the Lebanese complaint have confirmed the importance of the statement made by the representative of Lebanon on 28 February, in which he said:

> "Israeli military operations and inhumane practices in the regions still under Israeli occupation are daily becoming more severe and more violent, and now call for speedy and urgent action by the Council, to which we have come today with a legitimate complaint based on undeniable and irrefutable facts and evidence. To seek to justify or excuse those actions will not do any good whatever." [*2568th meeting, para.18.*]

149. The arguments adduced by Israel to justify its tyranny in southern Lebanon result from the continuation of its occupation of Lebanese territory and from its practices. We should, therefore, not be surprised if that occupation has led to a stiffening of Lebanese resistance. The resistance that Israel is encountering in southern Lebanon is only a normal reaction to its own use of force and its occupation.

150. The only solution for southern Lebanon is a withdrawal by the Israeli forces from all the recently occupied Lebanese territories, not recourse to repression, which has proved powerless to bring the Lebanese people to its knees.

151. What is happening in Lebanon proves an essential truth—that in the face of foreign occupation the only solution is withdrawal of the foreign forces, because there is no justification for such occupation, whatever pretexts are adduced.

152. The situation in southern Lebanon which is now before the Council has come about because of the Council's inability to implement the resolutions that it adopted after the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982, at a time when it demanded that Israel withdraw from all occupied Lebanese territories. In the past three years those resolutions have led to no international measures capable of securing their enforcement. This has been interpreted by certain warlike States as a green light justifying their imposing their will on small States, which in consequence lose confidence in the future of a world action based on the concepts and principles on which the United Nations was founded.

153. The Council has special responsibility in regard to Lebanon and its just requests. How can that responsibility be shouldered, except by acceding to the Lebanese requests, foremost among which is condemning and stopping Israeli practices, compelling Israel to respect and to apply the terms of the fourth Geneva Convention and to withdraw completely and unconditionally from the occupied territories on the basis of resolutions 425 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), and compelling it to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon?

154. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the German Democratic Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

155. Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): It is with deep sorrow that the delegation of the German Democratic Republic has learned of the decease of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. Together with the fraternal Soviet people, we mourn the death of a great statesman whose life and work were dedicated to the welfare of the Soviet Union and to the happiness of all people in the world. His name remains inseparably linked with the struggle for the preservation of peace and for friendship and understanding among peoples. His initiatives have contributed greatly to the activities of the Organization. The people of the German Democratic Republic has lost a good friend in Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. We wish to express to the delegation of the Soviet Union, and especially to you, Comrade Oleg Troyanovsky, and through you to the family of Konstantin Chernenko and to all Soviet comrades and friends, our heartfelt condolences.

156. Speaking today before the Council, I am pleased to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for this month. My delegation wishes you every success in the tasks facing the Council.

157. I wish also to join previous speakers in expressing thanks to the representative of India, Mr. Krishnan, for his wise conduct of the proceedings of the Council last month.

158. Since this is the first time this year that my delegation is speaking before the Council, I should like to congratulate the representatives of Australia, Denmark, Madagascar, Thailand and Trinidad and Tobago as new members of the Council and to wish them much success.

159. The Council has repeatedly had reason to deal with the occupation of Arab territories by Israel, in opposition to international law and with violations of human rights. This time it is dealing with crimes committed against the civilian population of southern Lebanon.

160. The representative of Lebanon gave a detailed report before the Council on the extent of the excesses and practices of the Israeli occupation troops.

161. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic shares the view of many representatives who have pointed out the causes of the aggravated situation in southern Lebanon.

162. Thus, the events in southern Lebanon demonstrate again the arrogant way in which the ruling circles of Israel disregard world public opinion and trample upon United Nations resolutions, in particular resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) of the Council. They would not act in such

a way were it not for the support given by well-known imperialist circles.

163. Present developments in that region again show that the ruling Israeli circles, encouraged by the assistance from their allies, despite various manoeuvres are not willing to abandon their policy of aggression and occupation. Rather, they are interested in maintaining the Middle East as an area of tension, as was demonstrated by recent events reflecting the imperialist policy of power. The brutal acts committed by the occupation troops against the civilian population in southern Lebanon which were characterized by various representatives here as a policy of "the iron fist" cannot therefore be considered in isolation from the entire situation in the region.

164. They underline anew that it is imperative to bring about a comprehensive solution of the Middle East conflict on the basis of United Nations resolutions demanding the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, as well as the implementation of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, including its right to establish a State of its own.

165. The German Democratic Republic supports the demand of the overwhelming majority of States for the convening of an international Middle East peace conference with the participation of all sides concerned, including the PLO. The convocation of such a conference would foster a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict and thus secure peace in that region.

166. Aligning itself with the position expressed in the communiqué adopted on 6 March by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at its urgent meeting, held in New York, concerning the situation in the areas occupied by Israel in southern Lebanon [*S/17008, annex*], the German Democratic Republic resolutely condemns the latest Israeli acts of terror and demands their immediate cessation. It shares the view of those States that it is imperative to implement Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) and to bring about the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel in order to restore the unity, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

167. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the United Arab Emirates. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

168. Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It was with deep sorrow that we received the news this morning of the death of the Soviet President, Konstantin Chernenko. On this occasion and in the name of the delegation of the United Arab Emirates, I extend our deepest condolences to the Soviet delegation. We hope that it will transmit them to the bereaved family and to the Government and people of the Soviet Union.

169. I have the honour, in the name of the delegation of the United Arab Emirates, to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for this month. We are certain that, with your well-known competence and your long experience in the Organization, you will conduct the work of the Council efficiently and objectively.

170. I also wish to express our appreciation and admiration on the ideal way in which the representative of India conducted the work of the Council last month.

171. I do not wish to repeat the details contained in the statement made by the representative of Lebanon when he addressed the Council on 28 February [*2568th meeting*] and at previous meetings, concerning Israeli arbitrary practices and the many kinds of torture, oppression and displacement to which the civilians of southern Lebanon have been subjected. The news of such practices is daily reported by the mass media; however, I should like to take up some points in this regard.

172. First, the Israeli acts of aggression against Lebanon and the continued Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon for more than two years are themselves flagrant violations of international law and a clear crime against humanity. We believe that the continued occupation, with all the ensuing practices, is the crux of the problem. Therefore, the termination of Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon and withdrawal of the Zionist invasion forces to the international borders constitute the main task of the Council. Without the fulfilment of that task, it would be difficult for us to imagine peace and stability being restored to Lebanon, in particular southern Lebanon. On that basis, we reiterate what we have already said frequently, namely, the need to implement Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), the latter calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel to the internationally recognized boundaries. Furthermore, we believe that the current situation and current Israeli practices in southern Lebanon are but a direct result of the non-implementation of those resolutions.

173. My second point is that the obstacles placed in the way of the Council and preventing it from adopting a resolution at its last series of meetings, in September last year [*2552nd to 2556th meetings*]—owing to some of its members—contributed to the increased tension and strengthened Israel in its arbitrary practices against the civilian population. The people in southern Lebanon then lost hope that the Council would do them justice, and that has led them to take measures to defend themselves and their territory and to retaliate with violence against Israeli violence. If the language of violence is the only one that Israel understands, the Lebanese national resistance in all its dimensions represents the rejection by the Lebanese people of occupation and its readiness to sacrifice martyrs in defence of its land and dignity.

174. Therefore the struggle of the Lebanese national resistance against the Israeli occupation authorities is not just an absolute right to that resistance; it is also a national duty founded on the experience of many peoples in their liberation wars against foreign occupation and invasion and confirmed by the right of peoples to live in peace and

freedom. Moreover, this resistance is sanctioned by numerous United Nations resolutions.

175. In the light of the well-known Israeli policies, we must recall that the Lebanese national resistance has been the prime mover behind Israel's declared intention to pull out of Lebanon. In view of the complex circumstances here in the Council and in the Lebanese territories, there is no other element that could compel Israel to commit itself to that declaration but the continued resistance against the Israeli forces.

176. On that basis, the United Arab Emirates welcomes the Lebanese national resistance struggle and holds it in high esteem. It reaffirms its support to the fraternal Lebanese people in its just struggle to regain its freedom, liberate its territory and restore its sovereignty over all its territories.

177. I now come to my third point. We have listened with deep concern to some statements in support of not adopting a resolution that would condemn Israeli practices, and invoking various pretexts such as Israel's intention to pull out and the danger that some interests would face. We believe that those pretexts have but one objective: to put pressure on the members of the Council. They can be understood only within the framework of the policies that their supporters and advocates pursue in their support of the expansionist and terrorist Israeli practices. Therefore we reject those pretexts and believe that prevarication about the Council's adopting the draft resolution [*S/17000*] threatens the lives of more Lebanese civilians.

178. Every day the people of southern Lebanon are subjected to more arbitrary practices, more collective killings, more demolition of houses and more organized oppression. Clear evidence of that is the massacre perpetrated by the Israeli occupation forces in the village of Ma'rakah only a few days after the Council had started its discussion on this item. The continued daily massacres are hard evidence of the fact that Israel flouts international legitimacy because of the protection it enjoys through the American veto.

179. In order for the Council to fulfil its responsibility towards international peace and security and the prevention of aggression and to reaffirm its credibility so that helpless States will not lose confidence in it and the United Nations in general, and on the basis of the complaints in numerous letters addressed by Lebanon to the Council and the Secretary-General, we appeal to all the members of the Council to help Lebanon regain sovereignty over its national soil, to stop the bloodshed on its territory and to put an end to the Israeli practices on Lebanese territory by voting in favour of the draft resolution submitted to this Council by Lebanon.

180. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Bangladesh. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

181. Mr. WASIUDDIN (Bangladesh): I should like at the outset to express our profound shock and grief at the sudden demise of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. On behalf of the members of my Mission and on my own behalf, I should like to convey our sincere and heartfelt condolences to the representative of the Soviet Union, the members of his Mission and the bereaved family on their great national loss.

182. Since the Bangladesh delegation is participating for the first time this year in a Council meeting, I shall begin my statement by expressing our warm felicitations to you, Sir, on the election of your great country to the Council and also on your assumption of the presidency for the current month. We are confident that the deliberations of the Council will immensely benefit from your vast experience and proven diplomatic skill.

183. Let me take this opportunity also, Sir, to convey our deep appreciation to your predecessor, Mr. Natarajan Krishnan, representative of India, for the exemplary manner in which he guided the work of the Council during the month of February.

184. The Council is again seized of a crisis threatening international peace and security, arising out of the latest Israeli operations and inhumane practices against the civilian population in the Lebanese territories occupied by Israel. These incidents are by no means isolated events of repression, but constitute yet another link in the long chain of Israel's policies of relentless expansion, occupation and unabated aggression against its Arab neighbours.

185. The representative of Lebanon, in his statements made to the Council at the 2568th meeting on 28 February, the 2570th meeting on 7 March and today, has already given a graphic description of the coercive methods and abusive practices employed by Israel against the civilian population in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district. The international press and other news media have also given us a vivid picture of the suffering of the Lebanese civilian population in the occupied territories.

186. Their villages and towns have been seized, their homes have been demolished, and they have been subjected to indiscriminate killing, detention, kidnapping, repression and humiliation. Only last week, a huge bomb exploded in a mosque in the village of Ma'rakah in southern Lebanon, killing at least 15 people. It is abundantly clear that the Israeli forces, which had earlier seized the town, are directly responsible for the incident. Bangladesh and the entire Islamic world received this news with deep shock and indignation.

187. The recent Israeli actions in southern Lebanon and in other occupied territories are clearly in violation of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949[2] and the norms of international law

They are also clearly intended to intimidate and terrorize the civilian population in the occupied territories. But the heroic Lebanese fighters have demonstrated once again that they cannot be suppressed or silenced.

188. The position of Bangladesh on the question of Lebanon has been firm and consistent. We have expressed in the strongest terms our condemnation of Israeli aggression against Lebanon and have reaffirmed our total and unflinching solidarity with our Lebanese brethren. My Government has repeatedly called for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon. We have also reiterated our unequivocal support to our Lebanese brethren in the achievement of national reconciliation and in preservation of the independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

189. The question of Lebanon, however, should not be viewed in isolation, as it constitutes an integral part of the overall Middle East question. In other words, any solution of the problem of Lebanon cannot be separated from a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The firm and unequivocal position of Bangladesh on the question of the Middle East has been based on our firm belief in the principles and purposes of the Charter and on our enduring commitment to the cause of oppressed peoples all over the world struggling to free themselves from the bondage of colonialism, aggression and exploitation, peoples committed to establishing their inalienable right to self-determination, national freedom and political independence.

190. Bangladesh views the essentials of any meaningful peace plan for the Middle East as a composite whole, a comprehensive settlement, every part thereof being integrally related to the other. We are firmly convinced that there cannot be any lasting peace in the region without a total withdrawal of Israeli forces from all occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and without the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to an independent State of their own. It is equally essential that the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, participate in any peace process on an equal footing. Any comprehensive plan must include these essential elements to restore just and lasting peace to the region.

191. The developments in the Middle East over nearly decades have demonstrated beyond any shadow of doubt that the complex problem of the Middle East cannot be solved by a few countries or by a major Power and its allies. The situation clearly calls for an international effort under the aegis of the United Nations to ensure that the interests and rights of all the parties concerned are met in a fully impartial and rational manner, with a view to evolving a just, viable and lasting settlement of the problem.

192. It is in this context that Bangladesh supported the proposal for the early convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East. The Arab peace plan, which my delegation has fully supported as a sound basis for the restoration of peace in the region, is already before the international community [*see S/15510, annex*]. In recent weeks, we have noted with interest that a number of concrete proposals have been made to initiate the peace process in the region. Israel, on the other hand, has further aggravated the situation in the region through its policy of terror and harassment in the occupied territories, with a view to obstructing the initiation of the peace process in the Middle East.

193. The failure of the Council in the past to act firmly and decisively has only encouraged Israel to intensify its aggression and barbarity. In the present circumstances, it is imperative that the Council proceed urgently, with all the authority and resources at its disposal, to avert a further blood-bath in southern Lebanon and other occupied territories and to secure the implementation of its own resolutions, particularly resolutions 425 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), in order to ensure Israel's immediate and unconditional withdrawal from the Lebanese territories to the internationally recognized boundaries.

194. The latest Israeli actions and measures are in clear violation of the fourth Geneva Convention and other norms of international law. Israel, the occupying Power, must be asked to desist forthwith from its illegal and abusive practices against the civilian population in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district, and to restore normal conditions in those areas. The situation in the region should also be kept under constant review, and the Secretary-General should be entrusted with reporting to the Council on the implementation of its resolutions.

195. In conclusion, let me thank the members of the Council for giving us this opportunity to take part in the current debate.

196. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Viet Nam. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

197. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): First, on behalf of the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, I extend to Comrade Oleg Troyanovsky and the delegations of the Soviet Union, the Byelorussian SSR and the Ukrainian SSR our deepest condolences on the death of Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Communist Party and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, an outstanding leader of the Soviet people and a great friend of the Vietnamese people. The death of President Chernenko is a cruel loss indeed, not only for the Soviet Union but also for the cause of friendship and understanding among peoples and peace in the world. I request the delegation of the Soviet Union to transmit to the Communist Party, the Government and the people of the Soviet Union and to the bereaved family our deepest feelings of fraternal sympathy.

[*The speaker continued in English.*]

198. Now, Sir, allow me to congratulate you warmly on your assumption of the presidency for this month. We are

confident that with your talents, your diplomatic skill and your long experience at the United Nations, you will guide the work of the Council to success.

199. I should like also to congratulate Mr. Krishnan, representative of India, on his efforts to fulfil his responsibility as President for the month of February.

200. Our participation today in a meeting of the Council for the first time in 1985 gives us a chance to welcome the new members of the Council and to thank all the members of the Council for giving us this opportunity to speak.

201. The entire world has been filled with shock and indignation at the new horrendous crimes committed by Israeli aggressors in the occupied areas in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district. If the aggressions committed by Israel against Lebanon in 1978 and 1982 showed the true colours of the aggressors, then these new crimes serve as further proof of what they actually are, as they retreat. In order to extricate itself from its economic difficulties and to avoid military defeat, Israel finally has to withdraw from Lebanon. Yet the so-called three-stage withdrawal plan has not been drawn up in good faith; it is simply a ploy to hoodwink public opinion.

202. First, Israel unilaterally cancelled the talks with the Government of Lebanon concerning the recovery of Lebanon's sovereignty over the areas from which Israeli troops are withdrawing. Secondly, Israel still reserves the right not only to teach Lebanon another lesson but also to come back whenever it likes; and, thirdly, it has obviously been trying to prepare the soil for sowing the seeds of Israeli-chosen henchmen, with the ultimate objective of "invisible Israel's occupation of Lebanon". To facilitate this, Israel is stepping up its suppression of the people opposing its occupation, and this has resulted in the killing or wounding of hundreds of innocent persons. These new acts are reminiscent of the genocide-like killings in Sabra and Shatila, so vehemently denounced and condemned throughout the world. We shall not yield to the temptation to cite all the specific cases set forth in document S/16974 and S/16974/Add.1.

203. What is even more grave is that while the representative of Lebanon, with a sinking heart, was submitting the case before the Council and while the Council was seriously considering it, Israel was committing more and more crimes. They have been described in detail by many previous speakers. Nothing can justify Israel's acts of genocide against innocent people in Lebanon or elsewhere in the areas it occupies; nor can anything save it from defeat—no matter how large the assistance given to it by its most powerful strategic ally is, or will be.

204. We resolutely demand that Israel put an immediate end to its abusive practices and its massacre of people in Lebanon, and that it respect the resolutions on the subject adopted so far by the Council and the rules and principles of international law, particularly the relevant provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[2] Israel must withdraw its troops from Lebanon without any conditions and with strict respect for Lebanon's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity; it must resume the talks with Lebanon so as to work out ways and means to ensure the latter's takeover.

205. My delegation fully supports Lebanon in its genuine efforts to recover its sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity. In this spirit, my delegation fully supports the communiqué adopted on 6 March by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at its urgent meeting, held in New York [*S/17008, annex*] and which the representative of India presented to the Council at its 2570th meeting. My delegation also strongly supports the just demands of Lebanon as contained in draft resolution S/17000, now before the Council. Furthermore, my delegation earnestly urges the Council to take appropriate measures to ensure the full implementation by Israel of all the Council's relevant resolutions.

206. The present developments in Lebanon are only part of the complicated situation in the Middle East. This situation can be solved only through a comprehensive peaceful settlement that guarantees the exercise of the right to self-determination by the Palestinian people and respect for the legitimate interests of all countries in the region, including an independent State of Palestine. Such a solution can be achieved only within the framework of an international conference on the Middle East. This is in complete conformity with the position taken by the United Nations and by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

207. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

208. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): We have learned with grief and distress of the passing away of Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union. His death is a great loss to all mankind. Great peoples produce great leaders. The pursuit of peace has been the corner-stone of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. We are certain that the Soviet Union will pursue its goal of attaining peace in the world, and in particular in our area—peace through a just solution to the question of Palestine conducive to a comprehensive and just solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, peace to be achieved within the framework of an international peace conference on the Middle East held under the auspices of the United Nations. We wish to express our condolences to the Soviet peoples and to our colleagues in the Mission of the Soviet Union.

209. We deem it a great honour that the Council has extended an invitation to the PLO to participate in this debate. We wish to thank all the members of the Council, regardless of the attitude of some.

210. Let me express at the outset our great satisfaction that you, Sir, a son of Africa and the representative of a country member of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, should have assumed the responsibility of presiding over the deliberations of the Council on an issue threatening international peace and security—deliberations mainly on acts of savagery by neo-Fascist troops of occupation in Lebanon. We are certain that, with your wisdom and dedication to the cause of oppressed peoples and to the cause of peace, you will guide these deliberations to results in conformity with the aims of the United Nations as spelled out in the Charter of the United Nations.

211. For the past few weeks the world has been witnessing on television screens and reading in the press horrors reminiscent of Nazi crimes and the holocaust. The Council is being informed daily of such acts of savagery against civilians in Lebanese territory under Israeli occupation. The latest such information was given to the Council at the beginning of these meetings: Nazi-like atrocities, such as standing people up against a wall and shooting them in cold blood.

212. I wish to recall that on a number of occasions Chairman Yasser Arafat alerted the Secretary-General and the Security Council in letters expressing his grave concern about the future of civilian populations, including Palestinian refugees. He also stressed the responsibilities of the United Nations. We Palestinians have suffered and we continue to suffer the atrocities perpetrated by the neo-Fascists of Tel Aviv.

213. Those neo-Fascist troops in southern Lebanon have shown no discrimination as to whether the victims are men, women or children—whether Lebanese or Palestinian, farmers ploughing their fields or worshippers of one faith or sect or another fulfilling their religious obligations. To the neo-Fascists, all those who resist the continuation of the occupation are the "enemy".

214. This *modus operandi* of the Fascists is not incidental; nor is it a newly developed method of action. We Palestinians have been and are still being subjected to such acts of State terrorism against civilian populations in the occupied territories—be it in southern Lebanon or Bethlehem. And here one must surely wonder whether these acts are in retaliation or whether they are the implementation of an ideology aimed at the elimination of all "alien elements" from the racist, exclusivist State of Israel. Are these acts in pursuance of a *Lebensraum* policy?

215. Members of the Council will recall that on 29 October 1967 the then Prime Minister of Israel, Eshkol, was reported by the Associated Press to have appealed for mass immigration from Western nations to increase the Jewish population of Israel and to settle the occupied West Bank. He was quoted as having said:

> "We need more Jews here in Israel . . .". They were also needed "in places where we don't exist today but which have biblical names."

It is significant to note here his reference to "places where we don't exist today but which have biblical names". The Zionist *Lebensraum* in Lebanon is common knowledge; it dates back to 1919, when the Zionist organization made public its aim for a Zionist homeland, as follows:

> "at a point on the Mediterranean Sea in the vicinity of Sidon and following the watersheds of the foothills of the Lebanon as far as Jisr El-Kara'on, then to El-Bire . . .".

That is but one of their ambitions in Lebanon.

216. According to the memoirs, dated 27 February 1954, of a former Israeli Prime Minister, Sharett, the following is noted:

> "Ben Gurion passed on to another issue. This is the time, he said, to push Lebanon, that is, the Maronites in that country, to proclaim a Christian State. I said that this was nonsense. The Maronites are divided. The partisans of Christian separatism are weak and will dare to do nothing. A Christian Lebanon would mean their giving up Tyre, Tripoli, the Bekaa. There is no force that could bring Lebanon back to its pre-World War I dimensions, and all the more so because in that case it would lose its economic raison d'être. Ben Gurion reacted furiously. He began to enumerate the historical justification for a restricted Christian Lebanon. If such a development were to take place, the Christian Powers would not dare oppose it. I claimed that there was no factor ready to create such a situation and that if we were to push and encourage it on our own we would get ourselves into an adventure that would place shame on us."

217. I have sensed no Christian support for the Nazi-like crimes which are committed by the Israeli forces of occupation—not only not from Christian sources, but from any other source.

218. According to Sharett, Ben Gurion was not satisfied and addressed a letter to him on 27 February 1954, in which he said:

> "It is clear that Lebanon is the weakest link in the Arab League. The other minorities in the Arab States are all Moslem, except for the Copts. But Egypt is the most compact and solid of the Arab States and the majority there consists of one solid block, of one race, religion and language, and the Christian minority does not seriously affect their political and national unity. Not so the Christians in Lebanon. They are a majority in the historical Lebanon and this majority has a tradition and a culture different from those of the other components of the League . . . But at times of confusion, or revolution or civil war, things take on another aspect, and even the weak declares himself to be a hero."

219. I shall not take up any more of the Council's time by citing everything that went on. But we know that on 16

May, Dayan—and everyone remembers who he was—said, according to Sharett's memoirs,

> "According to Dayan the only thing that's necessary is to find an officer, even just a major. We should either win his heart or buy him with money to make him agree to declare himself the saviour of the Maronite population."

220. We can clearly see what the Israelis are up to: they want that part of southern Lebanon.

221. Again one may recall that in 1978, in another Israeli act of aggression which resulted in the occupation of southern Lebanon, the then Israeli Chief of Staff, Mordechai Gur, had no hesitation in boasting about acts of savagery against the civilians under Israeli occupation. He told a journalist:

> "I do not lie to myself. I gave this order to the army. When I give an order to the IDF [Israeli Defense Forces] to enter a populated area, and when I authorize a doctrine of fire, I know what I am doing. When I ordered Yanush [Commander-in-Chief of the Northern Zone] to use planes, artillery and tanks, I knew what I was doing. When I told Yanush 'Move tanks into Maroun El-Ras as quickly as possible and shell the village from a distance before our men arrive and engage in a face-to-face battle', I did know what I was doing. I was the one who gave that order."

So, that spirit of criminal instinct is nothing new.

222. Need one recall that at Nuremburg, Nazi officers were brought to trial because they killed civilian hostages, and it did not help those officers to claim that the civilian population was hostile to them. Those officers, as we recall, were sentenced to death and executed, and that was because Nazi racism, Nazi *Lebensraum* and Nazi brutality were defeated. Soon the world will celebrate its triumph 40 years ago over facism and Nazism.

223. I wonder whether the neo-Nazis in the Zionist junta will participate in celebrating this commemorative event, or will lament the defeat of their allies and collaborators? Naturally, this is not the subject of our debate today, but, of course, when one refers to the collaboration between the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Nazis, one has to remember those things.

224. When we speak about the civilian population being hostile to the forces of occupation, hostility *per se* is not sufficient. What is needed is activity and militant resistance against the forces of occupation. It is armed struggle. It is a right, it is an inalienable right, a right of people to resist. This has also been legitimized by the General Assembly.

225. It has been claimed that these acts of violence are committed when Israel "has embarked on withdrawing its troops from Lebanon". This is a big lie, because the Israeli Cabinet has not—I repeat, has not—decided to withdraw from Lebanon in pursuance of Council resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). The Israeli Cabinet had decided, in the second phase, to deploy—mark my word—to deploy in the eastern sector of Lebanon, and, in the third phase, "Israel has decided that the IDF will deploy along the Israeli/Lebanese international border while maintaining a zone in southern Lebanon where local forces [South Lebanese Army] will operate with IDF backing."

226. The Lebanese people, the heroes who are putting up armed resistance, do not suffer over diplomatic niceties. For them, as for us Palestinians, deployment is not withdrawal; and the third phase of the so-called withdrawal is the implementation and entrenchment of the Zionist aims and ambitions in Lebanon, as exposed by Moshe Sharett and to which we referred earlier.

227. The heroes in that area are sending to Tel Aviv a very loud and clear message: resolution 509 (1982) calls for the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel and, ultimately, Israeli troops from all of Lebanon; maintaining Israeli control by proxy is not the will of the Lebanese people and consequently they exercise their right and carry out their duty to resist foreign occupation, including by the method of armed struggle.

228. The press has been reporting Rabin's "iron-fist" policy and action against Lebanon. As far as we remember, the "iron-fist" methodology to fulfil Zionist aims was predicated by the twisted thinking of a Zionist leader called Jabotinsky, whose memory is perpetuated on Israeli currency. Thus one can discern no difference in the attitude of Zionists towards others in the pursuit of achieving Zionist aims. Be they the Herut or the Labour Party, they are all criminally inclined to achieve their aim, namely, the elimination of others.

229. Unfortunately, this is also a method that the United States Government subscribes to, as was stated in this chamber before the Council by a distinguished—if I may say that—representative of the United States, when he used his negative vote [*2556th meeting*] to veto a draft resolution [*S/16732*] calling for a cessation of hostilities in Lebanon simply because it did not include reference to the elimination of Palestinian armed elements.

230. The Council has been subjected to attempts at diverting its attention. For example, the representative of the United States mentioned a cycle of violence. Now this is a malicious attempt to divert the attention and thrust of this deliberation and debate. In our opinion there is no cycle of violence; there is on the one hand Israeli aggression, Israeli fascist crimes, Israeli occupation, and on the other hand, there is the noble cause of resistance against occupation and there are the Lebanese who are heroically carrying out their duty, as well as exercising their right. So the cycle of violence does not exist.

231. The representative of the United States spoke about a rationale of conduct. She expressed concern about the rejection of what she called threats to members of the Council and their nationals. Now, this is demented logic, for how can we describe the acts of aggression by

the United States when it mined the territorial waters of Nicaragua, which was then a member of the Council? How can we explain the issuance by the United States Congress of Public Law 98-151 of 14 November 1983? I will spare the Council a reading of that. I trust that it may appear in the record. But that is a threat to the developing economies of nations. Is it not a crime in itself to institutionalize such threats against developing nations?

232. Let me assure the representative of the United States that all the support it shows to the junta in Tel Aviv and all the contacts, deliberations and bargaining by Assistant Secretary of State Murphy in the area, including the use of Lebanon and the Lebanese people as a bargaining chip in some deliberations and negotiations, will fail. We thought that the Washington Administration had learned a lesson when the Camp David process failed to bring peace to the area. At that time, the future of the Palestinian people was used as a bargaining chip. As the Camp David Accords were doomed to fail, so too are Murphy's deliberations.

233. Finally, the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all of Lebanon will definitely provide the atmosphere for no resistance, and consequently there will be no need for further deliberation in the Council, at least in so far as Lebanon is concerned.

234. In fulfilment of their obligations under the Charter, the members of the Council are called upon to deem it proper now to impose mandatory sanctions against Israel as a punishment for its acts of savagery and its continued threat to peace in the area, as well as to international peace and security.

235. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

236. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I wonder what your intentions are about how we should proceed further in this debate. I notice we still have a lengthy list of speakers, and I do not even know whether the list in front of me is a comprehensive list or whether there may yet be more. Given the lateness of the hour and conflicting engagements which some of us have, I personally would find it convenient if we were to close our deliberations for this evening rather soon.

237. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to recall that at our 2570th meeting I said I intended at today's meeting to continue the debate on the item on our agenda so that the Council might hear those representatives that had not been able to speak, and that we would then proceed to a vote on the draft resolution [*S/17000*]. That is what was agreed at the 2570th meeting. There are now 10 speakers on my list. Since there had been no formal request for suspension of the meeting, it was my intention to proceed in accordance with what I said at the 2570th meeting, that is, to exhaust our list of speakers this evening and proceed to a vote on the draft resolution. Is the representative of the United Kingdom satisfied with this response?

238. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, thank you for recalling what you said before. As I have already explained, I would prefer the Council to continue its discussion tomorrow morning, since we still have a lengthy list of speakers and there may well be more. If we do proceed to a vote tonight, there will certainly be a number of explanations of vote, so we shall not be hearing just 10 speakers; we shall get up to I do not know what number. In short, I hope we can continue tomorrow.

239. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): As you know, I am in the hands of the members of the Council. Would the representative of the United Kingdom like to call for the application of rule 33 to end the meeting? If so, I should be happy to ask the Council if it agrees to the application of that rule.

240. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): Yes, I should be happy if we could do that.

241. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The point raised by the representative of the United Kingdom falls under rule 33, which reads:

"The following motions shall have precedence in the order named over all principal motions and draft resolutions relative to the subject before the meeting:

"1. To suspend the meeting;

"2. To adjourn the meeting;

"3. To adjourn the meeting to a certain day or hour;

"4. To refer any matter to a committee, to the Secretary-General or to a rapporteur;

"5. To postpone discussion of the question to a certain day or indefinitely; or

"6. To introduce an amendment.

"Any motion for the suspension or for the simple adjournment of the meeting shall be decided without debate."

242. The members of the Council have heard the proposal made by the representative of the United Kingdom. Is there any objection to approval of that proposal? It appears not. The proposal is approved.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[2] *Ibid.*, No. 973.

[3] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1915).

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-61439—June 1994—1,925